

COURT FILE NUMBER QBG-SA-00766-2022

COURT OF KING'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN

JUDICIAL CENTRE SASKATOON

PLAINTIFFS CAITLIN ERICKSON, JENNIFER SOUCY (BEAUDRY)
and STEFANIE HUTCHINSON

DEFENDANTS KEITH JOHNSON, JOHN OLUBOBOKUN, KEN SCHULTZ,
NATHAN RYSAVY, DUFF FRIESEN, LYNETTE WEILER,
JOEL HALL, FRAN THEVENOT, LOU BRUNELLE, JAMES
RANDALL, TRACEY JOHNSON, SIMBO OLUBOBOKUN,
CATHERINE RANDALL, KEVIN MACMILLAN, ANNE
MACMILLAN, DAWN BEAUDRY, NATHAN SCHULTZ,
AARON BENNEWEIS, DEIDRE BENNEWEIS, DARCY
SCHUSTER, RANDY DONAUER, JOHN THURINGER, MILE
TWO CHURCH INC., THE GOVERNMENT OF
SASKATCHEWAN, JOHN DOES and JANE DOES

Brought under *The Class Actions Act*, SS 2001 c C-12.01

REPLY TO REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS

The Plaintiffs, Caitlin Erickson, Jennifer Soucy (Beaudry) and Stefanie Hutchinson, hereby reply as follows to the Defendant's, Catherine Randall's, Request for Particulars, dated October 30, 2023:

The Plaintiffs state generally that the nature of class action litigation is that not all instances of conduct captured by the conduct pleaded in the Second Amended Statement of Claim are, or can be, known to the Plaintiffs and that in this regard the Second Amended Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about" with respect to all of the particulars requested (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

The Plaintiffs state that particulars requiring the identification of perpetrator, victim, and date of each and every incident of abuse carried out by the Defendants against

members of the Plaintiff Classes, which occurred over a span of 1982 to present, is not reasonable, appropriate or consistent with either the general rules of pleadings or the rules of pleadings in a class action. Further, such requests for particulars are contrary to the purpose of class proceedings as a whole, and particularly respecting class proceedings prior to certification. Particularly pre-certification, the Class Plaintiffs do not, and can not, know of all conduct carried out against all of the Plaintiff Classes.

The Plaintiffs state that the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the allegations.

The Plaintiffs state that the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the individuals who were the victims of and suffered damages as a result of the allegations.

The Plaintiffs state that all of the conduct alleged in the Second Amended Statement of Claim occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan during the period from 1982 to present.

1. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
 - a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have been owed a fiduciary duty by Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged breaches of fiduciary duty;
 - c. The locations where the fiduciary duty was breached by Catherine Randall; and
 - d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the breaches of fiduciary duty of Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of "Individually Named Defendants" in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of "Defendants" in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff

Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
 - 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
 - 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
 - 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**
2. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
- a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged negligence and/or gross negligence;
 - c. The locations where the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence was committed by Catherine Randall; and
 - d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
- 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**

3. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
 - a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the assault and/or battery by Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged assault and/or battery;
 - c. The locations where the alleged assault and/or battery was committed by Catherine Randall; and
 - d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the assault and/or battery by Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**

3. **The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently** (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
 4. **The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars** (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).
4. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
- a. The identity of all individuals alleging mental suffering as a result of the actions or conduct of Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental suffering by Catherine Randall;
 - c. The locations where the alleged mental suffering took place; and
 - d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the infliction of mental suffering by Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

The mental suffering of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, continues and will continue for the rest of their lives.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
- 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**
5. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
 - a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have suffered damages or a loss as a result of the claim of alleged conspiracy against Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged conspiracy by Catherine Randall;
 - c. The locations where the alleged mental suffering took place; and
 - d. The particulars of the actions or conduct of Catherine Randall allegedly giving rise to a claim against Catherine Randall in conspiracy.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
- 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**
6. With respect to paragraph 31(d) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:

- a. The identity of all individuals alleging to be entitled to punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages from Catherine Randall;
- b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any conduct allegedly giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Catherine Randall; and
- c. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Catherine Randall allegedly giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**

4. **The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**

7. With respect to paragraph 31(e) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
 - a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been corporally punished by Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged corporal punishment by Catherine Randall;
 - c. The location that any alleged corporal punishment took place; and
 - d. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Catherine Randall giving rise to a claim against Catherine Randall relating to corporal punishment..

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

1. **The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**

- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her** (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
 - 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently** (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
 - 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars** (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).
8. With respect to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
- a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have a claim pursuant to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c);
 - b. The dates or timeframes of any alleged conduct giving rise to a claim against Catherine Randall in relation to the matters pleaded in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c);
 - c. The location that any alleged conduct took place; and
 - d. The particulars of alleged conduct of Catherine Randall giving rise to a claim against Catherine Randall relating to the claims set out in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c).
 - e. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been corporally punished by Catherine Randall;
 - f. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged corporal punishment by Catherine Randall;
 - g. The location that any alleged corporal punishment took place; and

- h. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Catherine Randall giving rise to a claim against Catherine Randall relating to corporal punishment..

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action. The conduct referred to in paragraph 32(b) and 32(c) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
- 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars**

(see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

9. With respect to paragraph 46 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
- a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been allegedly physically, emotionally and religiously abused by Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse by Catherine Randall;
 - c. The location that any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse took place; and
 - d. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Catherine Randall giving rise to a claim against Catherine Randall relating to physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**

2. **Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her** (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
 3. **The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently** (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
 4. **The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars** (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).
10. With respect to paragraph 47 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
- a. The identity of all individuals alleging physical or sexual assault and/or battery as a result of the actions or conduct of Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery by Catherine Randall;
 - c. The location that any alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery took place; and
 - d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the physical or sexual assault and/or battery by Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the

Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
 - 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
 - 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
 - 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**
11. With respect to paragraph 48 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
- a. The identity of all individuals alleging infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm as a result of the actions or conduct of Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by Catherine Randall;

- c. The location where the alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm took place; and
- d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
- 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars**

(see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

12. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Catherine Randall, including without limitation:
- a. The identity of all individuals alleging the threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury and/or intimidate students as a result of the actions or conduct of Catherine Randall;
 - b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury and/or intimidate students by Catherine Randall;
 - c. The location where the alleged threatened physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students took place; and
 - d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students by Catherine Randall.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

1. **The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter** (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
 2. **Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her** (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
 3. **The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently** (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
 4. **The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars** (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).
13. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or intentional infliction of mental injury allegedly observed by Catherine Randall not provided in reply to the requests as set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff

Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
 - 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
 - 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
 - 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**
14. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or intentional infliction of mental injury allegedly condoned or conspired to by Catherine Randall not provided in reply to the requests as set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of

“Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
 - 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
 - 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
 - 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**
15. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general particulars of any alleged threats by Catherine Randall of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery and/or infliction of mental injury, and any particulars of any alleged coercion or intimidation not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
 - 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
 - 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
 - 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**
16. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged incidents and alleged acts complained of and carried out by others that Catherine Randall, either

allegedly had knowledge of, directed or approved not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.

Reply:

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. Catherine Randall is included in the definition of “Individually Named Defendants” in paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and in the definition of “Defendants” in paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.


In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).**
- 2. Catherine Randall has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by her (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).**
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Catherine Randall in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).**
- 4. The Statement of Claim affords Catherine Randall sufficient information to enable her to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).**

DATED at the City of Saskatoon, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 28th day of December, 2023.

SCHARFSTEIN LLP

Per:


Solicitors for the Plaintiffs, Caitlin Erickson,
Jennifer Soucy (Beaudry), and Stefanie Hutchinson

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ADDRESS FOR SERVICE

Name of Firm: Scharfstein LLP
Name of lawyer in charge of file: Grant J. Scharfstein, K.C. / Samuel W. Edmondson
Address of Legal Firm: 200 Princeton Tower
123 – 2nd Avenue South
Saskatoon SK S7K 7E6
Telephone Number: (306) 653-2838
Fax Number: (306) 652-4747
Email address: gscharfstein@scharfsteinlaw.com / sedmondson@scharfsteinlaw.com
File number: 21,835.1